

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 37-39 have been added. Accordingly, claims 37-39 are now pending in this application. A Request for Continued Examination has been filed with this Amendment so that the claims may be fully considered.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stimson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,114 - hereafter "Stimson") in view of Reese (U.S. Patent No. 4,969,183 - hereafter "Reese") and Walker (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,863 - hereafter "Walker"). These rejections are rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims without prejudice or disclaimer.

Discussion of New Claims

Under the invention, as set forth in claims 37-39, the service provision device is able to accept as a method of payment for specific goods either an online slip or an ID number that must be displayed on the information terminal device. Thus, the user may choose the payment method according to circumstances at the time of purchase. When accepting the online slip as the method for payment for the specific goods, the online slip, which has an ID number recorded, is transmitted to the information terminal device, and the ID number of the online slip is transmitted to a

settlement authentication device. When accepting the ID number that must be displayed on the information terminal device as the method of payment for the specific goods, the service provision device transmits the ID number that must be displayed on the information terminal device to the information terminal device and the settlement authentication device. The settlement terminal device reads the recorded ID number that the online slip has output from the information terminal device, or the ID number that must be displayed on the information terminal device, and makes settlement.

Thus, the present invention enables choosing a preferred payment method depending on the circumstances at the time of purchase of goods. According to the invention, even when a customer does not have a printer, the customer is able to choose payment via the "ID number that must be displayed on the information terminal device." Accordingly, the customer does not have to write down the ID number. Moreover, because settlement is made by using the ID number transmitted from the service provision device, without using an ID number that the customer has written down, the chance of having a settlement error occur due to mistake during writing of the number can be avoided, and the settlement can be properly completed. These features are not taught or suggested by Stimson, Reese, Walker, or the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination.

Appl. No. 09/857,043
Amendment dated April 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2006

Docket No. TMI-103

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: April 25, 2006